

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and the following remarks are presented for the Examiner's consideration.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsujikawa (U.S. pat no 5,991,435) in view of Kishimoto (U.S. pat no 4,978,224) and official notice (MPEP 2144.03). Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claims 1 and 5, neither Tsujikawa nor Kishimoto discloses, teaches or renders obvious that the inspection data is generated by classifying and grouping solder element shape and position data corresponding to a plurality of pattern holes into at least one data group which is grouped according to a grouping condition apart from other data group, wherein the grouped data is identified by the grouping condition.

Tsujikawa does not disclose the above limitation as admitted by the Examiner in the Office Action.

The Office Action states that Kishimoto discloses the above limitation, since Kishimoto discusses two different grouping conditions, one being shown in Figure 3, where a plurality of chips are grouped together and the other being shown in Figure 17, where each chip is grouped individually. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Figure 3 in Kishimoto does not show the grouping processing of claims 1 and 5, but only shows that the circuit board to be inspected is divided into areas to be viewed on the basis of the transmitted data (Kishimoto; column 4, line 67 to column 5, line 1). Unlike the inventions of claims 1 and 5, Kishimoto's data are not grouped into a data group according to a grouping

condition apart from other data group. Also, Kishimoto does not disclose that grouped data is identified by the grouping condition, because Kishimoto's data are not grouped into a data group.

Figure 17 in Kishimoto only deals with the setting of viewing areas 31-33 for each of the blocks 34 (Kishimoto; column 8, lines 56-57). There is no disclosure in Figure 17 that data are grouped into a data group according to a grouping condition apart from other data group. Figure 17 is completely irrelevant to the inventions of claims 1 and 5.

Therefore, the asserted combination of Tsujikawa, Kishimoto and official notice does not render claims 1 and 5 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claims 1 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 and 6-8 which are dependent from claims 1 and 5, respectively should be allowable for at least the same reason as claims 1 and 5.

Claims 9-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsujikawa (U.S. pat no 5,991,435) in view of Kishimoto (U.S. pat no 4,978,224). Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 9, neither Tsujikawa nor Kishimoto discloses, teaches or renders obvious grouping means for classifying and grouping the element shape and position data into data groups which are grouped according to a grouping condition to identify at least one data group according to the grouping condition apart from other data group than the data group grouped. Regarding claim 15, neither Tsujikawa nor Kishimoto discloses, teaches or renders obvious that element shape and position data corresponding to a plurality of pattern holes is grouped into at least one data group which is grouped according to a grouping condition apart from other data group, wherein the grouped data is identified by the grouping condition.

Tsujikawa does not disclose the grouping means as admitted by the Examiner in the Office Action.

The Office Action states that Kishimoto discloses the grouping means, since Kishimoto discusses two different grouping conditions, one being shown in Figure 3, where a plurality of chips are grouped together and the other being shown in Figure 17, where each chip is grouped individually. Applicant respectfully disagrees. With respect to this issue, the same argument as described above regarding claims 1 and 5 will apply.


Therefore, the asserted combination of Tsujikawa and Kishimoto does not render claims 9 and 15 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claims 9 and 15 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-14 and 16-20 which are dependent from claims 9 and 15, respectively should be allowable for at least the same reason as claims 9 and 15.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 35948.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By:   
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39664

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: March 27, 2008